arXiv:1408.2385v1 [cs.CR] 11 Aug 2014

Trace representation of pseudorandom binary sequences derived from Euler quotients

Zhixiong Chen[1], Xiaoni Du[2] and Radwa Marzouk[3]
1. School of Mathematics, Putian University
Putian, Fujian 351100, P. R. China
Email: ptczx@126.com
2. College of Mathematics and Information Science
Northwest Normal University, Lanzhou, Gansu 730070, P. R. China
Email: ymldxn@126.com
3. Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science
Cairo University, Giza 12613, Egypt
E-mail: radwa@sci.cu.edu.eg

August 12, 2014

Abstract

We give the trace representation of a family of binary sequences derived from Euler quotients by determining the corresponding defining polynomials. Trace representation can help us producing the sequences efficiently and analyzing their cryptographic properties, such as linear complexity.

Keywords. Cryptography; Pseudorandom binary sequences; Euler quotients; Fermat quotients; Trace function.
MSC(2010): 94A55, 94A60, 65C10, 11B68

1 Introduction

For an odd prime p, integers $r \geq 1$ and u with $\gcd(u, p) = 1$, the *Euler quotient* modulo p^r, denoted by $Q_r(u)$, is defined as the unique integer by

$$Q_r(u) \equiv \frac{u^{\varphi(p^r)} - 1}{p^r} \pmod{p^r}, \quad 0 \leq Q_r(u) \leq p^r - 1,$$

where $\varphi(-)$ is the Euler totient function. See, e.g., [1, 12, 29] for details. In addition, we define

$$Q_r(u) = 0 \quad \text{if } p|u.$$

It is easy to verify

$$Q_r(uv) = Q_r(u) + Q_r(v) \pmod{p^r},\ \gcd(uv, p) = 1 \tag{1}$$

and

$$Q_r(u + kp^r) \equiv Q_r(u) - kp^{r-1}u^{-1} \pmod{p^r},\ \gcd(u, p) = 1,\ k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{2}$$

In particular, $Q_1(u)$ is called the *Fermat quotient*. Many number theoretic have been studied for Fermat and Euler quotients in [1, 4, 5, 12–14, 21, 28–34] and references therein.

More recently, Fermat and Euler quotients are studied from the viewpoint of cryptography, see [6–11,19,20,23,28]. Families of pseudorandom sequences are derived from Fermat and Euler quotients.

In this correspondence, we still concentrate on a family of binary sequences (e_u) defined by Euler quotients. For fixed $\mathfrak{r} \geq 1$, (e_u) is defined as

$$e_u = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq Q_{\mathfrak{r}}(u)/p^{\mathfrak{r}} < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq Q_{\mathfrak{r}}(u)/p^{\mathfrak{r}} < 1, \end{cases} \quad u \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

We note that (e_u) is $p^{\mathfrak{r}+1}$-periodic by (2). The linear complexity of (e_u) is investigated in [7] for $\mathfrak{r} = 1$ and in [19] for $\mathfrak{r} > 1$, respectively. Here, we will investigate a way to produce such binary sequences using trace function, which is extensively applied to producing pseudorandom sequences efficiently and analyzing their pseudorandom properties [22]. In particular, in [6] the first author has studied the trace representation of (e_u) for $\mathfrak{r} = 1$, the idea of which helps us to consider the case of $\mathfrak{r} \geq 2$.

We organize this correspondence as follows. In Section 2, we introduce generalized cyclotomic classes of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$ by using Euler quotients and determine the defining pair (see below for the definition) of (e_u). In Section 3, we present the trace representation of (e_u) in terms of its defining pair. We also give some remarks on the relationship between the defining pair of (e_u) and its linear complexity in the last section.

We conclude this section by introducing the definition of defining pair of a binary sequence. Let $\mathbb{F}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ be the binary field and $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$ the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}_2$. For a binary sequence (s_u) over $\mathbb{F}_2$ of odd period T, there exists a primitive T-th root $\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$ of unity and a polynomial $G(x) \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_2[x]$ of degree smaller than T such that

$$s_u = G(\beta^u),\ u \geq 0,$$

see [24, Theorem 6.8.2], we call the pair $(G(x), \beta)$ a *defining pair* of (s_u) and $G(x)$ the *defining polynomial* of (s_u) corresponding to β [16–18]. Note that for a given β, $G(x)$ is uniquely determined up to modulo $x^T - 1$ [18, Lemma 2].

2 Defining pair

We denote by $\mathbb{Z}_m = \{0, 1, \ldots, m-1\}$ the residue class ring modulo m and by $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$ the unit group of $\mathbb{Z}_m$. According to (1) and (2), the quotient $Q_r(-)$ defines a group epimorphism from $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*$ to $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}$.

Let

$$D_l^{(r)} = \{u : 0 \le u \le p^{r+1} - 1,\ \gcd(u, p) = 1,\ Q_r(u) = l\}$$

for $l = 0, 1, \ldots, p^r - 1$. Clearly, $D_0^{(r)}, D_1^{(r)}, \ldots, D_{p^r-1}^{(r)}$ form a partition of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*$.

Since $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*$ is cyclic, we choose the element $g \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*$ as a generator (g is also called a primitive element of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*$). We note here that the order of g, i.e., the least positive number n satisfying $g^n \equiv 1 \pmod{p^{r+1}}$, is $\varphi(p^{r+1})$. For convenience, we will choose a primitive element g such that $Q_r(g) = 1$. One might ask whether such g exists or not? In fact, we suppose that $Q_r(g) = a \ne 1$. It is easy to prove that $\gcd(a, p) = 1$. By (2) we get $Q_r(g^{a^{-1}}) = 1$, where a^{-1} is the inverse of a modulo p^r. Furtherly, we have

$$Q_r(g^{a^{-1}+kp^r}) \equiv 1 \pmod{p^r}$$

for all $0 \le k < p-1$. One can find a k_0 ($0 \le k_0 < p-1$) such that $\gcd(a^{-1} + k_0 p^r, \varphi(p^{r+1})) = 1$, i.e., $g^{a^{-1}+k_0p^r}$ is primitive modulo p^{r+1} and $Q_r(g^{a^{-1}+k_0p^r}) = 1$. Then we choose $g^{a^{-1}+k_0p^r}$ instead of g.

From now on, we always suppose that $Q_r(g) = 1$ for a fixed primitive element g modulo p^{r+1}. By (1) we get

$$D_0^{(r)} = \{g^{kp^r} \pmod{p^{r+1}} :\ 0 \le k < p-1\}$$

and

$$D_l^{(r)} := g^l D_0^{(r)} = \{g^{l+kp^r} \pmod{p^{r+1}} :\ 0 \le k < p-1\}$$

for $1 \le l < p^r$. So each $D_l^{(r)}$ exactly contains $p-1$ many elements. We will use the notation $D_{l+p^r}^{(r)} = D_l^{(r)}$ in the context.

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{(p^{\mathfrak{r}}+1)/2, (p^{\mathfrak{r}}+3)/2, \ldots, p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1\}$, one can define (e_u) equivalently by

$$e_u = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } u \bmod p^{\mathfrak{r}+1} \in \cup_{l\in\mathcal{I}} D_l^{(\mathfrak{r})}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad u \ge 0, \tag{4}$$

which helps us to determine the defining pair and hence the trace representation.

Lemma 1. *For $r \ge 1$, let $uD_l^{(r)} = \{uv \pmod{p^{r+1}} : v \in D_l^{(r)}\}$. If $u \in D_{l'}^{(r)}$, then we have*

$$uD_l^{(r)} = D_{l+l' \pmod{p^r}}^{(r)},$$

where $0 \le l, l' < p^r$.

Proof. The desired result follows from (1). □

Lemma 2. *For $r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq l < p^{r+1}$, we have*

$$\{u \pmod{p^{r+1}} : u \in D_l^{(r+1)}\} = D_{l \pmod{p^r}}^{(r)}.$$

Proof. For an integer u with $p \nmid u$, we write by Euler's theorem

$$u^{\varphi(p^r)} = 1 + \ell p^r \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $\ell = \ell_0 + \ell_1 p^r + \ell_2 p^{2r} + \ldots \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq \ell_i < p^r$ for $i \geq 0$. Then by the definition of Euler quotients, we have $Q_r(u) \equiv \ell \equiv \ell_0 \pmod{p^r}$. On the other hand, $Q_{r+1}(u) \equiv \ell + \frac{p-1}{2}\ell^2 p^r \equiv \ell_0 + (\frac{p-1}{2}\ell_0^2 + \ell_1)p^r \pmod{p^{r+1}}$, which is deduced from

$$u^{\varphi(p^{r+1})} = (u^{\varphi(p^r)})^p = (1 + \ell p^r)^p = 1 + \ell p^{r+1} + \frac{p-1}{2}\ell^2 p^{2r+1} + \ldots.$$

Therefore, we derive

$$Q_{r+1}(u) \equiv Q_r(u) \pmod{p^r},$$

which leads to

$$\{u \pmod{p^{r+1}} : u \in D_l^{(r+1)}\} \subseteq D_{l \pmod{p^r}}^{(r)}.$$

Now we show the cardinality of $\{u \pmod{p^{r+1}} : u \in D_l^{(r+1)}\}$ is $p-1$, wich equals that of $D_{l \pmod{p^r}}^{(r)}$. In fact, if $u \equiv u' \pmod{p^{r+1}}$ for $u, u' \in D_l^{(r+1)}$, we suppose $u' = u + k_0 p^{r+1}$ for some $0 \leq k_0 < p$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} l &\equiv Q_{r+1}(u) \equiv Q_{r+1}(u') \equiv Q_{r+1}(u + k_0 p^{r+1}) \\ &\equiv Q_{r+1}(u) - k_0 u^{-1} p^r \pmod{p^{r+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which indicates that $k_0 = 0$ and hence $u = u'$. We finish the proof. □

Define

$$D_l^{(r)}(x) = \sum_{u \in D_l^{(r)}} x^u \in \mathbb{F}_2[x]$$

for $l = 0, 1, \ldots, p^r - 1$.

For an element $\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$, we denote by $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma)$ the order of γ, i.e., the least positive integer n such that $\gamma^n = 1$.

Lemma 3. *Let $\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$ be of order $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma)$ with $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma) | p^{r+1}$. We have*

$$\sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(\gamma) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathrm{ord}(\gamma) = p, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. If $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma)=1$, i.e., $\gamma=1$, we have

$$\sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(1)=p^r(p-1)=0.$$

Since

$$\sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(\gamma)=\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*}\gamma^i=\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}}\gamma^i-\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}}\gamma^{ip},$$

if $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma)>p$, using the formula $1+x+\ldots+x^{n-1}=(1-x^n)/(1-x)$, we have

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}}\gamma^i=\frac{1-\gamma^{p^{r+1}}}{1-\gamma}=0,\ \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}}\gamma^{ip}=\frac{1-\gamma^{p^{r+1}}}{1-\gamma^p}=0.$$

While if $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma)=p$, we have

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}}\gamma^{ip}=\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_{p^r}}1=p^r=1.$$

We finish the proof. □

For $r\geq 1$, we define p^r-tuples

$$\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(x)=(D_i^{(r)}(x),D_{i+1}^{(r)}(x),\ldots,D_{i+p^r-1}^{(r)}(x)),\ i=0,1,\ldots,p^r-1.$$

We also use the notation $\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(x)^{\mathrm{T}}$, the transpose of $\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(x)$. We will calculate the inner product $\mathcal{C}_i(x)\cdot\mathcal{C}_j(x^{p^m})^{\mathrm{T}}$ for $0\leq i,j<p^r$.

Lemma 4. *Let $\theta\in\overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$ be a primitive p^{r+1}-th root of unity. For any fixed pair $0\leq i,j<p^r$, we have*

$$\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta)\cdot\mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m})^{\mathrm{T}}=0,\ r\geq 1$$

if $m\geq 1$, and

$$\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta)\cdot\mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}}=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } p^{r-1}||(i-j),\\ 0, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}\quad r\geq 2,$$

where $p^{r-1}||(i-j)$ means $p^{r-1}|(i-j)$ but $p^r\nmid(i-j)$, and

$$\mathcal{C}_i^{(1)}(\theta)\cdot\mathcal{C}_j^{(1)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}}=\begin{cases}0, & \text{if } i=j,\\ 1, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Proof. Firstly, if $m \geq r+1$ we have $\mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m}) = \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(1) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ since each $D_l^{(r)}(x)$ has $p-1$ many terms and $D_l^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m}) = D_l^{(r)}(1) = p-1 = 0$ for all $0 \leq l < p^r$. Hence, for all $0 \leq i, j < p^r$ we have

$$\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m})^{\mathrm{T}} = \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(1)^{\mathrm{T}} = 0.$$

Secondly, for $0 \leq i, j < p^r$ and $0 \leq m \leq r$, we note that $D_l^{(r)} = g^l D_0^{(r)}$ for all $l \geq 0$ since we always suppose $Q_r(g) = 1$, then we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m})^{\mathrm{T}} &= D_i^{(r)}(\theta) D_j^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m}) + D_{i+1}^{(r)}(\theta) D_{j+1}^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m}) + \\
&\quad \ldots + D_{i+p^r-1}^{(r)}(\theta) D_{j+p^r-1}^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m}) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{p^r-1} \sum_{u \in D_0^{(r)}} \theta^{ug^{i+k}} \sum_{v \in D_0} \theta^{vg^{j+k}p^m} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{p^r-1} \sum_{u \in D_0^{(r)}} \theta^{ug^{i+k}} \sum_{w \in D_0} \theta^{uwg^{j+k}p^m} \text{ (we use } v = uw) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{p^r-1} \sum_{u \in D_0^{(r)}} \sum_{w \in D_0^{(r)}} \theta^{ug^{j+k}(g^{i-j}+wp^m)} \\
&= \sum_{w \in D_0^{(r)}} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*} \gamma_w^z \text{ (we use } z = ug^{j+k}, \gamma_w = \theta^{g^{i-j}+wp^m}) \\
&= \sum_{w \in D_0^{(r)}} \sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(\gamma_w).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we need to determine $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma_w)$, the order of γ_w above for each $w \in D_0^{(r)}$. We note that $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma_w) | p^{r+1}$ since θ is a primitive p^{r+1}-th root of unity.

If $1 \leq m \leq r$, we find that $p \nmid (g^{i-j} + wp^m)$ for all $w \in D_0^{(r)}$ and hence $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma_w) = p^{r+1}$. So we get

$$\sum_{w \in D_0^{(r)}} \sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(\gamma_w) = 0$$

by Lemma 3. We finish the proof of the first claim.

Now we consider the case $m = 0$. For those $w \in D_0^{(r)}$ with $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma_w) \neq p$ we get

$$\sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(\gamma_w) = 0$$

by Lemma 3 again. While in this case ($m = 0$), we show below that there exists $w \in D_0^{(r)}$ such that $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma_w) = p$ if and only if $p^{r-1} || (i-j)$. That is, we need to find

solutions $w \in D_0^{(r)}$ satisfying

$$g^{i-j} + w \equiv l_0 p^r \pmod{p^{r+1}}$$

for some integer l_0 with $1 \le l_0 < p$. By (1) and (2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \equiv Q_r(w) &\equiv Q_r(-g^{i-j} + l_0 p^r) \\ &\equiv Q_r(-g^{i-j}) - l_0 p^{r-1}(-g^{i-j})^{-1} \\ &\equiv Q_r(-1) + (i-j)Q_r(g) - l_0 p^{r-1}(-g^{i-j})^{-1} \\ &\equiv (i-j) - l_0 p^{r-1}(-g^{i-j})^{-1} \pmod{p^r}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Then for fixed $0 \le i, j < p^r$, l_0 exists if and only if $p^{r-1} || (i-j)$. From (5) we also find that there is only one solution l_0 and hence only one w, written by w_0, such that $\mathrm{ord}(\gamma_{w_0}) = p$, in which case we obtain by Lemma 3 again

$$\sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(\gamma_{w_0}) = 1.$$

So we conclude that

$$\sum_{w \in D_0^{(r)}} \sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(\gamma_w) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } p^{r-1} || (i-j), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which finishes the proof of the second claim.

For the third claim, we can find the proof from [6, Lemma 3]. □

According to Lemma 2, we remark that $u \bmod p^{r+1} \in D_{l \pmod{p^r}}^{(r)}$ if $u \in D_l^{(r+1)}$ for $r \ge 1$. So together with Lemma 1, we will use $\mathcal{C}_{l+p^r}^{(r)}(x) = \mathcal{C}_l^{(r)}(x)$ for any integer $l \ge 0$.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathfrak{r} \ge 2$ and $\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$ be a fixed primitive $p^{\mathfrak{r}+1}$-th root of unity. Then for $0 \le i < p^{\mathfrak{r}}$, the defining pair of the binary sequence $(s_u^{(i)})$ defined by*

$$s_u^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } u \bmod p^{\mathfrak{r}+1} \in D_i^{(\mathfrak{r})}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad u \ge 0,$$

is $(G_i(x), \beta)$ with

$$G_i(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} x^{kp^{\mathfrak{r}}} + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}}.$$

Proof. For $u = 0$, we have

$$G_i(\beta^0) = G_i(1) = \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(1)^{\mathrm{T}}$$
$$= (p-1) + 0 = 0 = s_0^{(i)}.$$

For $u = u'p^m$ with $\gcd(u', p) = 1$ and $1 \le m \le \mathfrak{r}$, we also suppose $u' \bmod p^{\mathfrak{r}+1} \in D_j^{(\mathfrak{r})}$ for some j, then we derive by Lemmas 1 and 4

$$\begin{aligned} G_i(\beta^u) &= \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \beta^{kp^{\mathfrak{r}+m}u'} + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(\beta^{u'p^m p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &= p - 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(\theta^{u'p^m})^{\mathrm{T}} \text{ (we use } \theta = \beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta^{p^m})^{\mathrm{T}} = 0 = s_u^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $u \in D_j^{(\mathfrak{r})}$ with $0 \le j < p^{\mathfrak{r}}$, we have by Lemma 1

$$\begin{aligned} G_i(\beta^u) &= \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \beta^{kup^{\mathfrak{r}}} + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(\beta^{up^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(\theta^u)^{\mathrm{T}} \text{ (we use } \theta = \beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}}. \end{aligned}$$

We will proceed the proof by using the second and third claim in Lemma 4.

If $p \nmid (i-j)$, then $i \not\equiv j \pmod{p^r}$ for all $r \ge 1$. Hence we get

$$G_i(\beta^u) = 1 + \mathcal{C}_i^{(1)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(1)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{r=2}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}}$$
$$= 1 + 1 + 0 = 0 = s_u^{(i)}.$$

If $p^n || (i-j)$ for some $1 \le n < \mathfrak{r}$, which indicates $i \equiv j \pmod{p^r}$ for all $1 \le r \le n$ but $i \not\equiv j \pmod{p^r}$ for all $r > n$, then we get

$$G_i(\beta^u) = 1 + \mathcal{C}_i^{(n+1)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(n+1)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{\substack{r=1 \\ r \ne n+1}}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}}$$
$$= 1 + 1 + 0 = 0 = s_u^{(i)}.$$

Finally if $i = j$, we get

$$G_i(\beta^u) = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_j^{(r)}(\theta)^{\mathrm{T}} = 1 + 0 = s_u^{(i)}.$$

Putting everything together, we get $s_u^{(i)} = G_i(\beta^u)$ for all $u \geq 0$ and complete the proof. □

Applying Lemma 5, one can get the following important statement.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathfrak{r} \geq 2$ and $\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$ be a fixed primitive $p^{\mathfrak{r}+1}$-th root of unity. Then the defining polynomial $G(x)$ (corresponding to β) of the binary sequence (e_u) defined in (3) or (4) is*

$$G(x) = \frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}} - 1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} x^{kp^{\mathfrak{r}}} + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \sum_{i=(p^r+1)/2}^{p^r-1} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5 we see that the defining polynomial $G(x)$ of (e_u) is

$$G(x) = \frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}} - 1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} x^{kp^{\mathfrak{r}}} + \sum_{i=(p^{\mathfrak{r}}+1)/2}^{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1} \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}}.$$

On the other hand, re-arranging the following summation, we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p^r-1} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}} = \sum_{i=0}^{p^r-1} D_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} D_l^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) = 0$$

by Lemma 3 since $\mathrm{ord}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) = p^{r+1}$. Then using this fact we get

$$\sum_{i=(p^{\mathfrak{r}}+1)/2}^{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}} = \sum_{i=(p^r+1)/2}^{p^r-1} \mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})^{\mathrm{T}},$$

since the subscript i of $\mathcal{C}_i^{(r)}$ is reduced modulo p^r. We finish the proof. □

For example, let $p = 5$ and $\mathfrak{r} = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(x) &= 62 \sum_{k=1}^{4} x^{kp^3} + \sum_{i=3}^{4} \mathcal{C}_i^{(1)}(\beta^{p^2}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}(x^{p^2})^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=13}^{24} \mathcal{C}_i^{(2)}(\beta^p) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(2)}(x^p)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=63}^{124} \mathcal{C}_i^{(3)}(\beta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(3)}(x)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &= \sum_{i=3}^{4} \mathcal{C}_i^{(1)}(\beta^{p^2}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}(x^{p^2})^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=13}^{24} \mathcal{C}_i^{(2)}(\beta^p) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(2)}(x^p)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=63}^{124} \mathcal{C}_i^{(3)}(\beta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(3)}(x)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{F}_2[x]. \end{aligned}$$

Write $\theta_1 = \beta^{p^2}$, $\theta_2 = \beta^p$, $\theta = \beta$. Then θ_1 (resp. θ_2, θ_3) is a primitive p^2-th (resp. p^3-th, p^4-th) root of unity. Below we compute two examples.

If $u \in D_{17}^{(3)}$, then we have $u \in D_2^{(1)}$ and $u \in D_{17}^{(2)}$ by Lemma 2, hence we see that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\beta^u) &= \sum_{i=3}^{4} \mathcal{C}_i^{(1)}(\beta^{p^2}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}(\beta^{up^2})^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=13}^{24} \mathcal{C}_i^{(2)}(\beta^p) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(2)}(\beta^{up})^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=63}^{124} \mathcal{C}_i^{(3)}(\beta) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(3)}(\beta^u)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &= \sum_{i=3}^{4} \mathcal{C}_i^{(1)}(\theta_1) \cdot \mathcal{C}_2^{(1)}(\theta_1)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=13}^{24} \mathcal{C}_i^{(2)}(\theta_2) \cdot \mathcal{C}_{17}^{(2)}(\theta_2)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=63}^{124} \mathcal{C}_i^{(3)}(\theta_3) \cdot \mathcal{C}_{17}^{(3)}(\theta_3)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &= (1+1) + 1 + (1+1+1) \qquad \text{(by Lemma 4)} \\ &= 0 = e_u. \end{aligned}$$

If $u \in D_{85}^{(3)}$, then we have $u \in D_0^{(1)}$ and $u \in D_{10}^{(2)}$ by Lemma 2 again, we get similarly

$$\begin{aligned} G(\beta^u) &= \sum_{i=3}^{4} \mathcal{C}_i^{(1)}(\theta_1) \cdot \mathcal{C}_0^{(1)}(\theta_1)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=13}^{24} \mathcal{C}_i^{(2)}(\theta_2) \cdot \mathcal{C}_{10}^{(2)}(\theta_2)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=63}^{124} \mathcal{C}_i^{(3)}(\theta_3) \cdot \mathcal{C}_{85}^{(3)}(\theta_3)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &= (1+1) + (1+1) + 1 = 1 = e_u. \end{aligned}$$

3 Trace representation

The trace representation plays an important role in sequence design. The trace function from $\mathbb{F}_{2^n}$ to $\mathbb{F}_{2^k}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{Tr}_k^n(x) = x + x^{2^k} + x^{2^{2k}} + \ldots + x^{2^{(\frac{n}{k}-1)k}}.$$

For $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{2^k}$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_{2^n}$, we have $\mathrm{Tr}_k^n(ax+by) = a\mathrm{Tr}_k^n(x) + b\mathrm{Tr}_k^n(y)$. We refer the reader to [22, 25] for details on the trace function. The trace representations of many famous sequences, such as Legendre and Jacobi sequences and their generalizations, have been studied in literature [16–18].

Lemma 6. *We suppose that $2^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$. If the order of 2 modulo p is λ, then the order of 2 modulo p^r is λp^{r-1} for $r \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let $2^\lambda = 1 + k_0 p$ for some integer k_0, since λ is the order of 2 modulo p. We have

$$2^{\lambda p^{r-1}} \equiv (1 + k_0 p)^{p^{r-1}} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^r}.$$

According to the following two claims, we prove the desired result.

Claim 1. $2^{\lambda_1 p^{r-1}} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^r}$ for $\lambda_1 < \lambda$ with $\lambda_1 | \lambda$.

(proof of Claim 1.) Since otherwise, we have $2^{\lambda_1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, which contradicts to the condition that λ is the order of 2 modulo p.

Claim 2. $2^{\lambda p^{r-2}} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^r}$.

(proof of Claim 2.) We note first that $k_0 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ since

$$2^{p-1} \equiv (2^\lambda)^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}} \equiv (1 + k_0 p)^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}} \equiv 1 + \frac{p-1}{\lambda} k_0 p \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}.$$

Then we have

$$2^{\lambda p^{r-2}} \equiv (1 + k_0 p)^{p^{r-2}} \equiv 1 + k_0 p^{r-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^r}.$$

We finish the proof. □

Lemma 7. *We suppose that $2^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$. Let λ be the order of 2 modulo p and $Q_r(g) = 1$ for a (fixed) primitive root g modulo p^{r+1} for $r \geq 1$ as before. We have*

$$D_l^{(r)}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}-1} \mathrm{Tr}_{p^r}^{\lambda p^r} \left(x^{g^{jp^r+l}} \right), \ l \geq 0.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 6, we write

$$U^{(r)} = \{2^{jp^r} \pmod{p^{r+1}} : 0 \leq j < \lambda\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r+1}}^*.$$

It is clear that $U^{(r)}$ is a subgroup of $D_0^{(r)}$ due to $Q_r(2^{jp^r}) \equiv jp^r Q_r(2) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r}$ for $0 \leq j < \lambda$. Then we divide $D_0^{(r)}$ into $(p-1)/\lambda$ many subsets

$$U^{(r)}, \ g^{p^r} U^{(r)}, \ldots, g^{(\frac{p-1}{\lambda}-1)p^r} U^{(r)}.$$

Now applying

$$U^{(r)}(x) = \sum_{u \in U^{(r)}} x^u = \mathrm{Tr}_{p^r}^{\lambda p^r}(x) \in \mathbb{F}_2[x],$$

we derive

$$D_0^{(r)}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}-1} \mathrm{Tr}_{p^r}^{\lambda p^r} \left(x^{g^{jp^r}} \right).$$

Then the desired result follows from the fact that $D_l^{(r)} = g^l D_0^{(r)}$ for $l \geq 0$. □

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathfrak{r} \geq 2$ and $\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_2$ be a fixed primitive $p^{\mathfrak{r}+1}$-th root of unity. Let g be a (fixed) primitive root modulo $p^{\mathfrak{r}+1}$ such that $Q_{\mathfrak{r}}(g) = 1$. Let λ be the order of 2 modulo p. If $2^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$, then the trace representation of (e_u) defined in (3) is*

$$e_u = \frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}-1} \mathrm{Tr}_1^{\lambda}(\beta^{up^{\mathfrak{r}}g^k}) + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} \eta_l^{(r)} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}-1} \mathrm{Tr}_{p^r}^{\lambda p^r}\left(\beta^{up^{\mathfrak{r}-r}g^{jp^r+l}}\right),$$

where

$$\eta_l^{(r)} = \sum_{i=(p^r+1)/2}^{p^r-1} D_{i+l}^{(r)}(\beta^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}). \tag{6}$$

Proof. From Theorem 1, we re-write the defining polynomial $G(x)$ of (e_u) as

$$G(x) = \frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} x^{kp^{\mathfrak{r}}} + \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} \sum_{l=0}^{p^r-1} \eta_l^{(r)} D_l^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}}), \tag{7}$$

where $\eta_l^{(r)}$ is defined in (6). The trace representation of $D_l^{(r)}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}-r}})$ is given in Lemma 7. We remark that g is also a primitive root modulo p^r and $Q_r(g) = 1$ for all $1 \leq r \leq \mathfrak{r}+1$ since we suppose that g is a primitive root modulo $p^{\mathfrak{r}+1}$ such that $Q_{\mathfrak{r}}(g) = 1$. So we only need to describe $\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} x^{kp^{\mathfrak{r}}}$ by using trace function.

Since λ is the order of 2 modulo p and g is also a primitive root modulo p, we have

$$\mathbb{Z}_p^* = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}-1} g^k\langle 2\rangle,$$

where $\langle 2\rangle = \{1, 2, 2^2, \ldots, 2^{\lambda-1}\}$ generated by 2 modulo p is a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$. Hence we derive

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} x^{kp^{\mathfrak{r}}} = \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{p-1}{\lambda}-1} \mathrm{Tr}_1^{\lambda}(x^{p^{\mathfrak{r}}g^k}).$$

We complete the proof. □

For the case of $2^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$, we see that the order of 2 modulo p^r is not always λp^{r-1}, where λ is the order of 2 modulo p. For example, for $p = 1093$, the experimental result shows that the order of 2 modulo p^r is $\lambda = 364$ for $r = 1$ or 2 and the order of 2 modulo p^r is λp^{r-2} for $r \geq 3$.

In fact, for any such p (i.e., satisfying $2^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$), if λ is the order of 2 modulo p^r for all $1 \leq r \leq t_0$ with a maximal integer t_0, then the order of 2 modulo p^r is λp^{r-t_0} for all $r \geq t_0 + 1$ by using a similar proof of Lemma 6. In terms of

$$U^{(r)} = \{2^j \pmod{p^{r+1}} : 0 \leq j < \lambda\} \subseteq D_0^{(r)},\ r < t_0$$

and

$$U^{(r)} = \{2^{jp^{r+1-t_0}} \pmod{p^{r+1}} : 0 \le j < \lambda\} \subseteq D_0^{(r)},\ r \ge t_0,$$

one can apply the idea of Lemma 7 to describing the trace of each $D_l^{(r)}(x)$ and hence the defining polynomial $G(x)$ of (e_u) without any difficulties.

We finally remark that such primes p, which are called Wieferich primes, are very rare. To date the only known such primes are $p = 1093$ and $p = 3511$ and it was reported that there are no new such primes $p < 4 \times 10^{12}$, see [15].

4 Final remarks

In this manuscript, we give the trace representation of a family of binary threshold sequences derived from Euler quotients by determining the corresponding defining polynomials.

The defining polynomial of a sequence plays an important role in cryptography. It is closely related to the linear complexity of the sequence. We recall that the *linear complexity* $L((e_u))$ is the least order L of a linear recurrence relation over $\mathbb{F}_2$

$$e_{u+L} = c_{L-1}e_{u+L-1} + \ldots + c_1 e_{u+1} + c_0 e_u \quad \text{for } u \ge 0,$$

which is satisfied by (e_u) and where $c_0 = 1, c_1, \ldots, c_{L-1} \in \mathbb{F}_2$. For a sequence to be cryptographically strong, its linear complexity should be large and at least a half of the period according to the Berlekamp-Massey algorithm [26]. From [3] or [22, Theorem 6.3], the linear complexity of (e_u) equals the number of nonzero coefficients of the defining polynomial $G(x)$, i.e., the *Hamming weight* of $G(x)$.

According to the proof of [19, Lemma 6], we see that $\eta_l^{(r)} \ne 0$ in (6) for all $1 \le r \le \mathfrak{r}$ and $0 \le l < p^r$. Hence if $2^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$, we get by computing the Hamming weight of $G(x)$ in (7)

$$\begin{aligned} L((e_u)) &= \sum_{r=1}^{\mathfrak{r}} p^r(p-1) + (p-1)\epsilon\left(\frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1}{2}\right) \\ &= p^{\mathfrak{r}+1} - p + (p-1)\epsilon\left(\frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1}{2}\right) \\ &= \begin{cases} p^{\mathfrak{r}+1} - p, & \text{if } p \equiv 1 \pmod 4, \\ p^{\mathfrak{r}+1} - p, & \text{if } p \equiv 3 \pmod 4 \text{ and } \mathfrak{r} \text{ is even}, \\ p^{\mathfrak{r}+1} - 1, & \text{if } p \equiv 3 \pmod 4 \text{ and } \mathfrak{r} \text{ is odd}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which has been proved in [19, Theorem 1]. The notation $\epsilon\left(\frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1}{2}\right)$ above satisfies

$$\epsilon\left(\frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1}{2}\right) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \frac{p^{\mathfrak{r}}-1}{2} \text{ is even}, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Acknowledgements

Z. Chen was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No.61373140. X. Du was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant 61202395 and the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University (NCET-12-0620).

References

[1] T. Agoh, K.Dilcher, L. Skula, Fermat quotients for composite moduli, J. Number Theory 66(1) (1997) 29-50.

[2] H. Aly and A. Winterhof. Boolean functions derived from Fermat quotients. Cryptogr. Commun. 3 (2011) 165–174.

[3] R. E. Blahut. Transform techniques for error control codes. IBM J. Res. Develop. 23 (1979) 299–315.

[4] J. Bourgain, K. Ford, S. Konyagin and I. E. Shparlinski. On the divisibility of Fermat quotients. Michigan Math. J. 59 (2010) 313–328.

[5] M. C. Chang. Short character sums with Fermat quotients. Acta Arith. 152 (2012) 23–38.

[6] Z. X. Chen. Trace representation and linear complexity of binary sequences derived from Fermat quotients. Sci. China Inf. Sci. (2014) (to appear)

[7] Z. X. Chen and X. N. Du. On the linear complexity of binary threshold sequences derived from Fermat quotients. Des. Codes Cryptogr. 67 (2013) 317–323.

[8] Z. X. Chen and D. Gómez-Pérez. Linear complexity of binary sequences derived from polynomial quotients. Sequences and Their Applications-SETA 2012, 181–189, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., 7280, Springer, Berlin, 2012.

[9] Z. X. Chen, Z. H. Niu and C. H. Wu. On the k-error linear complexity of binary sequences derived from polynomial quotients. http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.6626, 2013.

[10] Z. X. Chen, L. Hu, X. N. Du, Linear complexity of some binary sequences derived from Fermat quotients, China Commun. 9(2) (2012) 105-108.

[11] Z. X. Chen, A. Ostafe, A. Winterhof, Structure of pseudorandom numbers derived from Fermat quotients, in: Proc. of WAIFI 2010, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 6087, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2010, pp.73-85.

[12] Z. X. Chen, A. Winterhof, On the distribution of pseudorandom numbers and vectors derived from Euler-Fermat quotients, International Journal of Number Theory 8 (3)(2012) 631-641.

[13] Z. X. Chen and A. Winterhof. Additive character sums of polynomial quotients. Theory and Applications of Finite Fields-Fq10, 67–73, Contemp. Math., 579, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.

[14] Z. X. Chen and A. Winterhof. Interpolation of Fermat quotients. SIAM J. Discr. Math. 28 (2014) 1–7.

[15] R. Crandall, K. Dilcher and C. Pomerance. A search for Wieferich and Wilson primes. Math. Comp. 66 (217) (1997) 433–449.

[16] Z. D. Dai, G. Gong and H. Y. Song. Trace representation and linear complexity of binary e-th residue sequences. Int'l Workshop on Coding and Cryptography-WCC 2003, 121–133, Versailles, France, 2003.

[17] Z. D. Dai, G. Gong and H. Y. Song. A trace representation of binary Jacobi sequences. Discrete Math. 309 (2009) 1517–1527.

[18] Z. D. Dai, G. Gong, H. Y. Song and D. F. Ye. Trace representation and linear complexity of binary e-th power residue sequences of period p. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 57 (2011) 1530–1547.

[19] X. N. Du, Z. X. Chen, L. Hu, Linear complexity of binary sequences derived from Euler quotients with prime-power modulus, Information Processing Letters, 112(12) (2012) 604-609.

[20] X. N. Du, A. Klapper, Z. X. Chen, Linear complexity of pseudorandom sequences generated by Fermat quotients and their generalizations, Information Processing Letters 112(6) (2012) 233-237.

[21] R. Ernvall, T. Metsänkylä, On the p-divisibility of Fermat quotients, Math. Comp. 66(219) (1997) 1353-1365.

[22] Golomb S W, Gong G. Signal Design for Good Correlation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005

[23] D. Gómez-Pérez and A. Winterhof. Multiplicative character sums of Fermat quotients and pseudorandom sequences. Period. Math. Hungar. 64 (2012) 161–168.

[24] D. Jungnickel. Finite Fields: Structure and Arithmetics. Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim, 1993.

[25] R. Lidl, H. Niederreiter, Finite Fields, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1983.

[26] J. L. Massey, Shift register synthesis and BCH decoding, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 15(1) (1969) 122-127.

[27] M. B. Nathanson. Elementary Methods in Number Theory. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 195. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.

[28] A. Ostafe, I.E. Shparlinski, Pseudorandomness and dynamics of Fermat quotients, SIAM J. Discr. Math. 25(1) (2011) 50-71.

[29] M. Sha, The arithmetic of Carmichael quotients, http://arxiv.org/abs/1108.2579v5, 2013.

[30] I. E. Shparlinski, Character sums with Fermat quotients, Quart. J. Math. 62(4) (2011) 1031-1043.

[31] I. E. Shparlinski, Bounds of multiplicative character sums with Fermat quotients of primes, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 83(3) (2011) 456-462 .

[32] I. E. Shparlinski, On the value set of Fermat quotients, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140(4) (2012) 1199-1206.

[33] I. E. Shparlinski, Fermat quotients: Exponential sums, value set and primitive roots, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 43(6) (2011) 1228-1238.

[34] I. E. Shparlinski and A. Winterhof. Distribution of values of polynomial Fermat quotients. Finite Fields Appl. 19 (2013) 93–104.

[35] A. Winterhof, Linear complexity and related complexity measures, In selected topics in information and coding theory, World Scientific, 2010, pp.3-40.